

Comment on the proposed precedence of NEMONYCHIDAE Bedel, November 1882 (Insecta, Coleoptera) over CIMBERIDIDAE Gozis, March 1882, and the proposed conservation of usage of *Chimberis* Gozis, 1881
(Case 3093; see BZN 60: 275–280; 61: 171)

Alexander Riedel

*Staatliches Museum für Naturkunde Karlsruhe, Erbprinzenstr. 13,
D-76133 Karlsruhe, Germany*

As an entomologist working on the taxonomy and systematics of certain groups of weevils (CURCULIONOIDEA) I noticed with great interest the study on the nomenclature of NEMONYCHIDAE. I was surprised by the complex problems outlined in the paper threatening the present nomenclature of the group. Lyal & Alonso-Zarazaga have thoroughly described the nomenclatural problems.

I support the proposals, especially the conservation of the family name NEMONYCHIDAE OVER CIMBERIDIDAE. The NEMONYCHIDAE are the most plesiomorphic branch of the weevils, so this family has been treated extensively in the literature and should be conserved.

Comment on the proposed conservation of the specific name of *Macropodus concolor* Ahl, 1937 (Osteichthyes, OSPHRONEMIDAE)
(Case 3255; see BZN 60: 206–207; 61: 114–116, 173–174)

Ingo Schindler

Warthestr. 53 A, D-12051 Berlin, Germany

Wolfgang Staeck

Auf dem Grat 41 A, D-14195 Berlin, Germany

The comment by Kottelat et al. (see BZN 61: 114–116) to reject the proposed conservation of the specific name of *Macropodus concolor* Ahl, 1937 contains errors and mistakes disqualifying the authors' argument. Although the black paradise fish, *Macropodus concolor*, was originally described by Schreitmüller in a popular aquarium magazine (1936a, b), the first description satisfying the standards of fish taxonomy was published by Ahl (1937) in a well known and widely distributed zoological journal.

The argument by Kottelat et al. (BZN 61: 114–115) that *M. concolor* Ahl, 1937 is a junior homonym of *M. concolor* Schreitmüller, 1936 is not acceptable, because Schreitmüller (1936b) explicitly disclaims any intention to create a nomen novum (see Article 8.3 of the Code). According to the decisions taken at the Budapest Congress in 1929, after 1931 all works with nomenclatural acts have to be published with the intention and for the purpose of permanent scientific record (Articles 8, 11 and 13).

Even if the view of Kottelat et al. is accepted, *M. concolor* Ahl, 1937 is not automatically an invalid homonym of *M. concolor* Schreitmüller, 1936 because the latter is also a nomen oblitum. According to Article 23.9 of the Code it does not make